

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/923,868	08/06/2001	Dmitri Loguinov	US 010359	9768	
24737	7590 11/15/2005	EXAM	EXAMINER		
	TELLECTUAL PROP	SHAH, CH	SHAH, CHIRAG G		
P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2664		

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/923,868	LOGUINOV, DMITRI	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Chirag G. Shah	2664	

Advisory Action	09/923,868	LOGUINOV, DMITRI					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Chirag G. Shah	2664					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
	THE REPLY FILED 24 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
<ul> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</li> <li>a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In</li> </ul>							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS							
<ul> <li>3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		~	Pel				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-40</u> .		Ajit P					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		Primary E	xaminer				
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>	ut before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	t be entered s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>			nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)13. Other:							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant continues to argue that, inferring, from that number of packets lost, that capacity has been exceeded does not seem to automatically imply that the adjusted rate is "a function of the determined bandwidth capacity of the network. Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's allegation that Wesley does not disclose of the adjusted rate being a funciton of the determined bandwidth capacity. Examiner redirects Applicant to Wesley's reference, specificially in col. 3, lines 56-67, claim 1 and col. 5, lines 27-35, where Wesley clearly establishes that that congestion condition while receiving packets indicates that the bandwidth capacity of the network within the sampling window does not support the receiving packets at the current rate, thus in turn a receiver sends feedback signal information to direct the sender to adjust a rate of transmission for the stream of packets that is supported by the network. Furthermore, when the number of packets being received exceeds the capacity, adjusting the rate is function of a bandwidth capacity of the network at the sampling window. In additions, Applicants are presenting additional argument, which do not render the claims allowable after the prosecution on the merit is closed.